

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Final Office Action of March 10, 2003 has been received and contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 15 and 19 and adds new claim 20. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15-17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanazawa et al. (US Pat. No. 5,953,088); rejected claims 1, 3-7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over den Boer et al. (US Pat. No. 5,641,974) in view of Yoshino (US Pat. No. 5,358,810); rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over den Boer et al. in view of Yoshino as applied to claims 1, 3-7, and 9 above, and further in view of Kobayashi et al. (US Pat. No. 5,847,792); rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over den Boer et al. in view of Yoshino as applied to claims 1, 3-7, and 9 above, and further in view of Hanazawa et al. ('088); rejected claims 10-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanazawa et al. ('088) in view of Murade (US Pat. No. 6,388,721); rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanazawa et al. ('088) in view of Murade, and further in view of Hanazawa et al. (US Pat. No. 6,400,427) and den Boer et al.; rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanazawa et al. ('088) in view of Hanazawa et al. ('427) and den Boer et al.. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The rejection of claims 15-17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanazawa et al. ('088) and claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanazawa et al. ('088) in view of Hanazawa et al. ('427) and den Boer et al. are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 15 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 15 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein the cut-off film is substantially overlapped by the data line in the data line direction." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15, and claims 16-19, which depend

therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over den Boer et al. in view of Yoshino, the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over den Boer et al. in view of Yoshino as applied to claims 1, 3-7, and 9 above, and further in view of Kobayashi et al., and the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over den Boer et al. in view of Yoshino as applied to claims 1, 3-7, and 9 above, and further in view of Hanazawa et al. ('088) are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein the black matrix of the color filter plate asymmetrically overlaps the data line of the thin film transistor plate." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and claims 2-5, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner states in the Office Action of September 11, 2002, "den Boer discloses...wherein the black matrix of the counter plate asymmetrically overlaps the date line of the thin film transistor plate (col. 10, lines 58-62)." (Office Action at p. 3) Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of den Boer et al. described above for the following reasons. The Col. 10, Lines 58-62 of den Boer et al. discloses, "Black matrix portions 56 and address lines 5 are both arranged so that their central axes correspond with the gaps between pixel electrodes 3 according to certain embodiments of this invention." Applicants respectfully submit that, as best understood, the above disclosure and Fig. 7 of den Boer et al. show that the black matrix 56 are aligned *symmetrically* [emphasis added] with the address line 5, more particularly with the center line of the address line, which corresponds to the center of the gap between pixel electrodes 3. Applicants respectfully further submit that the asymmetrical alignment between the black matrix and the data line is one of the main subject matters according to an embodiment of the present invention in order to achieve a LCD device that reduces cross-talk problems between the pixel electrode and the gate line, and between the pixel electrode and the neighboring pixel electrode, while minimally sacrificing the aperture ratio.

Claim 6 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 6 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "wherein the pixel electrode partially overlaps the first data line at a first end of the pixel electrode... wherein the pixel electrode partially overlaps a second data line at a second end of the pixel electrode opposite the first end." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6, and claims 7-9, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 10-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanazawa et al. ('088) in view of Murade and the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanazawa et al. ('088) in view of Murade, and further in view of Hanazawa et al. ('427) and den Boer et al. are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 10 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 10 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "wherein a cut-off film is formed under the data line, said cut-off film being asymmetrically overlapped by the data line and being partially overlapped by the pixel electrode, and wherein the cut-off film is substantially overlapped by the data line in the data line direction." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, and claims 11-14, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the feature, "the cut-off film is substantially overlapped by the data line in the data line direction," is also one of the main inventive subject matters according to an embodiment of the present application, and that this feature is utilized to minimize the light leakage in the B' portion in Figs. 19A and 19B of the present invention.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496 - 7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: September 9, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Song K. Jung

Registration No.: 35,210
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

DC:50238998.1



30827
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: September 9, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Song K. Jung
Registration No.: 35,210
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

DC:50238998.1